



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/625,398      | 07/26/2000  | Eric C. Anderson     | P205/US             | 7721             |

49278 7590 01/17/2007  
SCENERA RESEARCH, LLC  
111 Corning Road  
Suite 220  
Cary, NC 27518

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2164

| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE  | DELIVERY MODE |
|--|------------|---------------|
| 3 MONTHS                               | 01/17/2007 | PAPER         |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

|                              |                        |                     |  |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b> | <b>Applicant(s)</b> |  |
|                              | 09/625,398             | ANDERSON ET AL.     |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b>        | <b>Art Unit</b>     |  |
|                              | Melissa M. Chojnacki   | 2164                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 12-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Remarks*

1. In response to communications filed on November 8, 2006, claims 1- 10, 12-15, 17-19, and 23-35 have been amended, no new claims have been added and claim 11 has been cancelled. Therefore claims 1-40 are still presently pending in this application.

### *Drawings*

2. The Amended version of Figure 5 was received on May 24, 2004. The Amended Figure 5 is acceptable.

### *Claim Objections*

3. Claims 1-10 and 12-40 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claims 1, 10, 22, 30, and 34-35 recite the limitation "**such that**", which renders the claim vague and indefinite, because it is unclear as to what "**such that**", signifies in the claim.

Claims 2-9, 12-21, 31-32 and 36-38 are objected to because they are dependent upon rejected independent claims 1, and 10.

Claim 22, recites the limitation "**it appears**", which renders the claim vague and indefinite, because it is unclear as to what "**it**", signifies in the claim. and also "**appears**" is an abstract term and is not a concrete action.

Art Unit: 2164

Claims 10, 23, and 34-35, recite the limitation "**particular** entity", which renders the claim vague and indefinite, because it is unclear as to what "**particular**", signifies in the claim.

Claims 12-21, 24-33, and 36-40 are objected to because they are dependent upon rejected independent claims 10, and 23.

Claim 29, recites the limitation "**in order** to", examiner suggests deleting "**in order**" because "**in order**" suggests "intended use" (See MPEP § 2111.04). Therefore, the claim language suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure.

Claim 36, recites the limitation "**is capable of**", examiner suggests changing "**is capable of**", to "the online photo-sharing service ~~is capable of hosting~~ hosts the entity...", because "**is capable of**", suggests "intended use" (See MPEP § 2111.04). Therefore, the claim language suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure.

Claim 38, recites the limitation "**is capable of**", examiner suggests changing "**is capable of**", to "the online photo-sharing service ~~is capable of accessing~~ accesses a server...", because "**is capable of**", suggests "intended use" (See MPEP § 2111.04). Therefore, the claim language suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitation “network enabled image capture devices” in lines 10, 12 and 14-15. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim because the original limitation in lines 2-3 and 6 recites “**entity-specific** network enabled image capture devices”. For the purpose of examination, the examiner is making the assumption that ““entity-specific network enabled image capture devices” is the same as “network enabled image capture devices”. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the “image capture devices” are the “plurality of entities” or if the entities are something entirely different. Clarification within the claim language is required.

Claims 2-9, 31 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph because they are dependent on rejected independent claim 1.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-5, 10, 12-17, 23-26 and 34-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Thompson (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,831), in view of Creamer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,930,709).

As to claim 1, Thompson teaches a method for providing access to respective entity-specific photo-sharing websites for a plurality of entities, each controlling a set of entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43), where “entity-specific photo-sharing websites” is read on “hosting service provider”), comprising:

providing an online photo-sharing service capable of providing access to the respective entity-specific photo-sharing websites for each of the entities (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43); and

providing software for the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices that causes the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices to transmit entity ID information (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27) when the image capture devices transmit images to the photo-sharing service over a network (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27), such that when the image capture devices connect to the photo-sharing service via the network, the photo-sharing service uses the entity ID received from the image capture devices to automatically associate the images received from the image capture device to the photo-sharing website of the identified entity (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64).

Thompson does not teach including a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection.

Creamer et al. teaches an integrated internet/intranet camera (See abstract), in which he teaches a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection (See column 1, lines 17-21; column 24, lines 64-67; column 25, lines 1-5; column 27, lines 38-41, where Creamer et al. discloses that “a TCP-IP protocol stack” is used to enable a camera and the internet).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Thompson, to include a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thompson, by the teachings of Creamer et al. because a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection would provide an inexpensive and efficient camera that communicates with the internet (See column 2, lines 48-54).

As to claims 2 and 12, Thompson as modified, teaches further including the step of storing the entity ID in the network-enabled image capture devices during

Art Unit: 2164

manufacturing (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27); wherein the entity ID is stored in the digital camera during manufacturing (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27).

As to claims 3 and 13, Thompson as modified, teaches further including the step of storing the entity ID in the network-enabled image capture devices subsequent to manufacturing (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27); wherein the entity ID is stored in the digital camera subsequent to manufacturing (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27).

As to claim 4, Thompson as modified, teaches further including providing a plurality of entity IDs, wherein each entity ID identifies a different entity (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27).

As to claim 5, Thompson as modified, teaches further including providing an entity ID identifying a camera manufacturer (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27) and an entity ID identifying a user (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27).

As to claim 10, Thompson, teaches an online photo-sharing system (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43), comprising:



Art Unit: 2164

an online photo-sharing service for providing access to respective photo-sharing websites for a plurality of entities (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38), wherein each of the entities controls a set of network-enabled digital cameras (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38); and network-enabled digital camera software that is customized for each of the entities, such that when the software customized for a particular entity is executed in the entity's network-enabled digital cameras during a network connection to the photo-sharing service the software causes the network-enabled digital cameras to automatically upload images and transmit the entity ID information for the particular entity to the photo-sharing service over the Internet connection (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64), allowing the photo-sharing service to use the entity ID information received from the network-enabled digital cameras to automatically associate the uploaded images with the photo-sharing website for that particular entity (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64).

Thompson does not teach including a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection.

Creamer et al. teaches an integrated internet/intranet camera (See abstract), in which he teaches a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection (See column 1, lines 17-21; column 24, lines 64-67;

Art Unit: 2164

column 25, lines 1-5; column 27, lines 38-41, where Creamer et al. discloses that “a TCP-IP protocol stack” is used to enable a camera and the internet).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Thompson, to include a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thompson, by the teachings of Creamer et al. because a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection would provide an inexpensive and efficient camera that communicates with the internet (See column 2, lines 48-54).

As to claims 14 and 24, Thompson as modified, teaches wherein at least one set of network-enabled digital cameras is controlled by a hierarchal relationship of entities Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27; column 8, lines 55-64); further including the step of customizing at least one of the cameras for a hierarchal relationship of entities Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to Claims 15 and 25, Thompson as modified, teaches wherein the network-enabled digital camera transmits the entity ID of each of the entities in the hierarchal

Art Unit: 2164

relationship (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27; column 8, lines 55-64); further including the steps of providing the entity ID as a set of hierarchal entity IDs (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to claim 16, Thompson as modified, teaches wherein the entities include at least one of a camera manufacturer, a business, a government agency, and end-users (See Thompson, column 2, lines 54-65).

As to claim 17, Thompson as modified, teaches wherein the online photo-sharing service includes a server and a database for providing access to the respective websites (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43).

As to claim 23, Thompson teaches a method for automatically sending images from entity-specific cameras to entity-specific websites (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43, where "entity-specific photo-sharing websites" is read on "hosting service provider"), comprising:

customizing a plurality of entity-specific cameras for different entities by loading at least one entity ID into the camera (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64);

providing an online photo-sharing service for providing access to a plurality of photo-sharing websites (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43);

Art Unit: 2164

customizing each of the photo-sharing websites for a respective entity to create entity-specific websites, each of the entity-specific websites being identified by a respective entity ID (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64);

transmitting the respective entity ID for a particular entity-specific website from the camera to the photo-sharing service when uploading images from the camera to the photo-sharing service via the internet connection (See column 6, lines 55-67); and

receiving the images and associating the images with the entity-specific website identified by the particular entity ID (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64).

Thompson does not teach including a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection.

Creamer et al. teaches an integrated internet/intranet camera (See abstract), in which he teaches a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection (See column 1, lines 17-21; column 24, lines 64-67; column 25, lines 1-5; column 27, lines 38-41, where Creamer et al. discloses that “a TCP-IP protocol stack” is used to enable a camera and the internet).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Thompson, to include a TCP-IP

Art Unit: 2164

protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thompson, by the teachings of Creamer et al. because a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection would provide an inexpensive and efficient camera that communicates with the internet (See column 2, lines 48-54).

As to claim 26, Thompson as modified, teaches further including storing the entity-specific websites on a database accessed by a server (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to claim 34, Thompson teaches an online photo-sharing system (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43, where “entity-specific photo-sharing websites” is read on “hosting service provider”), comprising:

an online photo-sharing service for providing access to respective websites for a plurality of entities (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64), wherein each of the entities controls a set of network-enabled digital cameras (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64), the set of network-enabled digital cameras including digital camera software that is customized for each of the entities, such that when the software customized for a

Art Unit: 2164

particular entity is executed in the entity's digital cameras during a network connection (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64), the software causes the network-enabled digital cameras to automatically upload images and transmit the entity ID information for the particular entity to the photo-sharing service over the Internet connection, allowing the photo-sharing service to use the entity ID information received from the network-enabled digital cameras to automatically associate the uploaded images with to the photo-sharing website hosted for that particular entity (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43).

Thompson does not teach including a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection.

Creamer et al. teaches an integrated internet/intranet camera (See abstract), in which he teaches a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection (See column 1, lines 17-21; column 24, lines 64-67; column 25, lines 1-5; column 27, lines 38-41, where Creamer et al. discloses that "a TCP-IP protocol stack" is used to enable a camera and the internet).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Thompson, to include a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection.

Art Unit: 2164

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thompson, by the teachings of Creamer et al. because a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection would provide an inexpensive and efficient camera that communicates with the internet (See column 2, lines 48-54).

As to claim 35, Thompson teaches an online photo-sharing system (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43, where "entity-specific photo-sharing websites" is read on "hosting service provider"), comprising:  
a plurality of digital cameras for accessing an online photo-sharing service for providing access to respective websites for a plurality of entities (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64), wherein each of the entities controls a set of digital cameras of the plurality of digital cameras (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64), each of the plurality of digital cameras including digital camera software that is customized for each of the entities, such that when the software customized for a particular entity is executed in the entity's digital cameras during a network connection (See column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64), the software causes the digital cameras to automatically upload images and transmit the entity ID information for the particular entity to the photo-sharing service over the Internet connection, allowing the photo-sharing service to use the entity ID information received from the network-enabled

Art Unit: 2164

digital cameras to automatically associate the uploaded images with to the photo-sharing website hosted for that particular entity (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43; column 6, lines 55-67).

Thompson does not teach including a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection.

Creamer et al. teaches an integrated internet/intranet camera (See abstract), in which he teaches a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection (See column 1, lines 17-21; column 24, lines 64-67; column 25, lines 1-5; column 27, lines 38-41, where Creamer et al. discloses that "a TCP-IP protocol stack" is used to enable a camera and the internet).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Thompson, to include a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thompson, by the teachings of Creamer et al. because a TCP-IP protocol stack that enables communication between the entity-specific network-enabled image capture devices and the online photo-sharing service via an Internet connection would provide an inexpensive and efficient camera that communicates with the internet (See column 2, lines 48-54).



As to claim 36, Thompson as modified, teaches wherein the online photo-sharing service is capable of hosting the entity specific photo-sharing websites for each of the entities (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to claim 37-38 and 40, Thompson as modified, teaches wherein the entity specific photo-sharing websites are hosted outside of the photo-sharing service (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64); wherein the online photo-sharing service is capable of accessing a server (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64) and a database outside of the photo-sharing service for hosting the respective websites (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64); wherein the database storing the entity specific websites is arranged outside the photo-sharing service (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to claim 39, Thompson as modified, teaches wherein the database storing the entity-specific websites is included within the photo-sharing service (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64).

8. Claims 6-9, 18-22 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,831), in view of Creamer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,930,709), in further view of Garfinkle et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,017,157).

As to claim 6, Thompson as modified, teaches further including the step of storing an entity account in a database corresponding to different entity IDs (See Garfinkle et al., column 3, line 67; column 4, lines 1-6).

Thompson as modified, does not teach further including the step of storing an entity account in a database corresponding to different entity IDs.

Garfinkle et al. teaches a method of processing digital images and distributing visual prints produced from the digital images (See abstract), in which he teaches further including the step of storing an entity account in a database corresponding to different entity IDs (See Garfinkle et al., column 3, line 67; column 4, lines 1-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Thompson as modified,, to include further including the step of storing an entity account in a database corresponding to different entity IDs.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thompson as modified,, by the teachings of Garfinkle et al. because further including the step of storing an entity account in a database corresponding to different entity IDs would provide a method of processing

Art Unit: 2164

digital images more economically and easily available via a secure network (See Garfinkle et al. column 1, lines 41-55).

As to claims 7, 19 and 27, Thompson as modified, teaches further including the step of associating with each of the entity accounts, web pages comprising the corresponding entity-specific photo-sharing website, and user account numbers of authorized users (See Thompson, abstract; column 2, lines 23-43; column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27); wherein the server matches each one of the entity ID's received with one of the entity accounts (See Thompson, abstract; column 2, lines 23-43; column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27); further including the step of creating an entity account in the database for every entity ID, and associating each of the entity-specific websites with the corresponding entity account (See Thompson, abstract; column 2, lines 23-43; column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27).

As to claims 8 and 18, Thompson as modified, teaches further including the step of matching the entity ID information received from each image capture device with the corresponding entity account in the database (See Garfinkle et al., Fig. 4; column 10, lines 44-45; lines 55-59; and also see Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27); wherein the database stores entity account information for each one of the entities (See Garfinkle et al., Fig. 4; column 3, line 67; column 4, lines 1-6; column 10, lines 44-45; lines 55-59; and also see Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27).

As to claim 9, Thompson as modified, teaches further including the step of automatically associating the received images with the entity-specific photo-sharing website of the identified entity (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to claim 20, Thompson as modified, teaches wherein the online photo-sharing service derives revenue from the entities (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to claim 21, Thompson as modified, teaches wherein the online photo-sharing service shares revenue with multiple entities that are in a hierarchal relationship (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to claim 22, Thompson teaches wherein the respective websites are customized for each of the entities, such that when users visit the respective websites over the network, it appears to the user that the respective websites are hosted by the corresponding entities (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-27; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to claim 28, Thompson as modified, teaches further including the step of associating URL's of the entity specific websites with the corresponding entity accounts in the database (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to claim 29, Thompson as modified, teaches further including the steps of matching a received entity ID with one of the entity accounts in order to associate the received images with the entity specific website (See Thompson, column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64).

As to claim 30, Thompson as modified, teaches further including the step of transmitting a user entity ID with the entity ID, and creating a user account in the database corresponding to the user ID (See abstract; column 2, lines 23-43), such that the received images are associated with the users account in the corresponding entity-specific website (See Thompson column 6, lines 55-67; column 7, lines 1-3, lines 13-38; column 8, lines 55-64).

9. Claims 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Thompson (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,831), in view of Creamer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,930,709), in further view of Narayan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,035,323).

Art Unit: 2164

As to claims 31-33, Thompson as modified, still does not teach providing a default Internet service provider connection information; providing the plurality of cameras with default Internet service provider connection information.

Narayan et al. teaches methods and apparatus for distributing a collection of digital media over a network with automatic generation of presentable media (See Abstract), in which providing a default internet service provider connection information (See abstract; column 11, lines 7-49); (g) providing the plurality of cameras with default internet service provider connection information (See abstract; column 11, lines 7-49).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Thompson as modified,, to include providing a default internet service provider connection information; (g) providing the plurality of cameras with default internet service provider connection information.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Thompson as modified,, by the teachings of Narayan et al. because providing a default internet service provider connection information; (g) providing the plurality of cameras with default internet service provider connection information would allow a user of a digital camera to easily distribute or publish images from the digital camera or other digital acquisition devices over a network, such as the Internet (See Narayan et al., column 2, lines 28-31).

***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 08-November -2006, with respect to the rejected claims 1-10 and 12-40 have been fully considered but they are not found to be persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments regarding "in response to the Examiner's statement that the claim language does not specify how the connection to the network is made, Applicant contends that claim 1 now makes clear that the camera is a network-enabled (e.g., web-enabled) device that communicates with the online photo-sharing service using a TCP/IP connection via the Internet", the arguments have been fully considered but are not found to be persuasive, because the specification, as cited by the applicant, clearly states "web-enabled devices". The examiner is asking that the applicant use the language that is defined in the specification when amending the claim language, especially when the language is being used to overcome the prior art of record. This is because "network" as defined by the Microsoft dictionary 5<sup>th</sup> edition is "A group of computers and associated devices that are connected by communication facilities. A network can involve permanent connections, such as cables, or temporary connections made through telephone or other communication links". Therefore, "network-enabled" can still read on the current art of record according to the definition of "network" and does not specifically state that the connection is wireless as the applicant states in the Remark submitted 11/8/2006. Furthermore, the examiner has used Creamer et al. to disclose a digital camera connected to the internet via a "TCP-IP protocol" (See column 1, lines 17-21; column 24, lines 64-67; column 25, lines 1-5;

Art Unit: 2164

column 27, lines 38-41), by replacing the digital camera and internet connection taught in Thompson with that of Creamer et al. the prior art does read on the present claims.

11. Applicant's arguments filed on November 8, 2006, with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M. Chojnacki whose telephone number is (571) 272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Application/Control Number: 09/625,398  
Art Unit: 2164

Page 24

January 5, 2007  
Mmc

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sam Rimell', is positioned above the printed name.

**SAM RIMELL**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**